

Amendments to the Drawings

The attached drawing sheets provide the amended Figures 1 and 3; the "Prior Art" designation has been added to Figure 1 and the hydraulic valve described in paragraph [0020] has been added to Figure 3. No new matter has been added.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets 1 and 2

25.0242 (Appl. No. 10/820,082)

Amdt. Dated February 21, 2006

Reply to Office communication of September 21, 2005

REMARKS

In the Official Action of September 21, 2005, claims 17-20 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph; claims 1, 2 and 4 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b); claims 3, 5, 6, and 7 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a); claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e); claims 8-16 were allowed; claims 17-20 were indicated as allowable if rewritten; and the drawings and disclosure were objected to.

The present communication is fully responsive to the Official Action of September 21, 2005.

Drawings

Figure 1 was objected to for failure to designate the Figure as "Prior Art." Figure 1 has been amended accordingly.

Additionally, the drawings were objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) as failing to show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. In particular, it was indicated that the stripper element (claim 14) and the hydraulic valve (claim 17) needed to be shown or canceled from the claims. In response, Applicant has amended Figure 3 to show the hydraulic valve (claim 17) that is described in paragraph [0020] and canceled claim 14. No new matter has been added.

Disclosure

In addition to the informalities identified by the Examiner, Applicant has made additional corrections to the disclosure as provided for in the Amendments to the Specification that began on page 3 of this document.

25.0242 (Appl. No. 10/820,082)

Amdt. Dated February 21, 2006

Reply to Office communication of September 21, 2005

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 112, second paragraph

Claims 17-20 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 17 has been amended in accordance with the Examiner's recommendation.

Accordingly, claims 17-20 are now in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102(b)

Claims 1, 2 and 4 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Krautkramer et al. Claim 4 has been cancelled. As will be discussed below, Krautkramer et al fails to describe each and every element of the remaining referenced claims 1 and 2.

With regard to independent claim 1, Krautkramer et al fails to describe "repeating steps a through d along a length of the tubular at a high rate of speed." The device described in Krautkramer is directed to taking single measurements at specific locations and makes no mention of repeating the measurements "along the length of the tubular at a high rate of speed."

Accordingly, for at least the above reason, the 102(b) rejection of claims 1 and 2 is traversed and the claims are allowable.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103(a)**Claims 3, 5, 6 over Krautkramer et al in view of Livingston**

Claims 3, 5, and 6 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krautkramer et al in view of Livingston (US Patent No. 5,303,592). Claim 5 has been

25.0242 (Appl. No. 10/820,082)

Amdt. Dated February 21, 2006

Reply to Office communication of September 21, 2005

cancelled.

In order to establish *prima facie* obviousness, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981 (CCPA 1974). Neither cited reference teaches the steps of repeatedly contacting the tubular with an elastomeric coupling material and releasing such contact at a high rate of speed. As discussed above with regard to the 102(b) rejection, the device described in Krautkramer is directed to taking single measurements at specific location. The device discussed in Livingston is directed to taking continuous measurements by utilizing a fluid couplant that remains in constant contact with the coiled tubing that travels therethrough. The device in Livingston teaches away from cyclic contact with the coupling material. As neither reference individually teaches or suggests the claimed limitations, any combination of the above-cited references similarly fails to teach or suggest such claim limitations.

For the above reasons, *prima facie* obviousness has not been established and the rejection of claims 3 and 6 is improper.

Claim 7 over Krautkramer et al in view of Brech

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krautkramer et al in view of Brech et al (US Patent No. 3,583,211).

As discussed above, both Krautkramer et al and Brech et al fail to teach the steps of repeatedly contacting the tubular with an elastomeric coupling material and releasing such contact at a high rate of speed. Accordingly, any combination of the two references similarly fails to teach or suggest such claim limitations.

For the above reasons, *prima facie* obviousness has not been established and the rejection of claim 7 is improper.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102(e)

Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Linares et al (6,782,751). Claims 4 and 5 have been cancelled. As will be discussed below, Linares et al fails to describe each and every element of the remaining referenced claims (1-3 and 6).

With regard to independent claim 1, Linares et al fails to describe “repeating steps a through d along a length of the tubular at a high rate of speed.” The device described in Krautkramer is directed to taking single measurements at specific locations and makes no mention of repeating the measurements “along the length of the tubular at a high rate of speed.”

Accordingly, for at least the above reason, the 102(3) rejection of claims 1-3 and 6 is traversed and the claims are allowable.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103(a)

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Linares et al in view of Brech et al.

As discussed above, both Linares et al and Brech et al fail to teach the steps of repeatedly contacting the tubular with an elastomeric coupling material and releasing such contact at a high rate of speed. Accordingly, any combination of the two references similarly fails to teach or suggest such claim limitations.

For the above reasons, prima facie obviousness has not been established and the rejection of claim 7 is improper.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 8-16 were indicated as being allowable. Claim 14 was cancelled.

25.0242 (Appl. No. 10/820,082)

Amdt. Dated February 21, 2006

Reply to Office communication of September 21, 2005

Claims 17-20 were indicated as being allowable if rewritten to overcome the 112 rejection. Claim 17 has been amended accordingly and claims 17-20 should now be in condition for allowance.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,



Tim Curington
Reg. No. 45,944

Tim W. Curington
Schlumberger Technology Corporation
110 Schlumberger Drive, MD1
Sugar Land, Texas 77478
281-285-4524
281-285-8569 (fax)